

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 27 and 39 – 53 were pending when the above-identified application was last examined. Claims 1 – 27 and 39 – 53 were rejected. Claims 1, 14, 27, and 39 are being amended for purposes of clarity. Support for claim amendments are found throughout the specification (e.g., page 18, lines 25 – 30). Claims 28 – 38, and 54 – 89 are being canceled. Claims 1 – 27 and 39 – 53 remain pending. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

In sections 2 and 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 – 10, 14 – 23, 27, 40 and 43 – 47 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0212655 to Volcani et al. (hereinafter *Volcani*). Applicants traverse.

Claim 1 is patentable over *Volcani* by at least reciting:

A method for language enhancement, comprising:
receiving text;
identifying grammatical constructs within the text; and
enhancing the received text by suggesting at least one alternate text portion from a user-selected style profile for at least one original portion of the text, the alternate text portion being consistent with the grammatical constructs of the original portion and having substantially the same meaning as the original portion but conveying a different impression.

In contrast, *Volcani* teaches amending text only for “various lexical impact values (happy, sorrow, anger) and... reading level.” (Paragraph 94). In other words, *Volcani* teaches changing text to match an emotion or for ease of reading, not to a different style. Specifically, with respect to claim 10, the Examiner states that reading level is the equivalent of style. However, to change a reading level is not the same as to change a style as changing a reading level (i.e., to a lower level) must give the same impression. For example, changing a reading level of text does not allow the text to change to a poetic style. Changing a reading level only enables text to be simplified so that it can be understood by a larger percentage of readers. (See paragraph 107). Further, changing a reading level is diametrically opposed to enhancing text according to a style as the enhancing will make the text more appropriate to specific users of the style (e.g., a specific subset of readers) instead of to a larger percentage of readers.

As such, claim 1 is patentable over *Volcani*. Further, claims 14, 27 and 39 recite similar limitations and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons. The remaining claims are dependent on one of claims 1, 14, 27 and 39 and are therefore patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from patentable claims.

If the Examiner has any questions or needs any additional information, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 10/3/06
Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P.
600 Hansen Way
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1043
Telephone (650) 843-3375
Facsimile (650) 843-8777

By 
Aaron Wininger
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 45,229